



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,695	12/20/2001	James Loik	JL-00017-US (PAR)	4192
2512	7590	11/10/2004	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			HAMILTON, ISAAC N	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3724		

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/027,695	LOIK, JAMES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isaac N Hamilton	3724	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Isaac N Hamilton. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Janik Marcovici. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 November 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,11,15,59,60 and 63.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cutlan (403,521).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Boyer Ashley
BOYER ASHLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserted that claim 1 limited the structure to allow both the tool and the workpiece to be revolved in separate uses of the tool, however, it is believed that claim 1 allows either the tool or the workpiece to be revolved. Applicant asserted that the revolving action of the tool gives the tool structure; however, it is believed that no structure is defined by the revolving action of the tool or the workpiece. Applicant asserted that revolving the tool about the workpiece has a different meaning than rotating the tool about the workpiece, however, it is believed that in claim 1 these terms are interchangeable, and they define the same intended use of the tool. Applicant asserted that the angle between the cutting edge and the centerline of the workpiece is not changed, and that the secondary component is not adapted to guide the workpiece in a different direction in Cutlan. However, it is believed that element g in Cutlan is adapted to guide the workpiece in a different direction and changes the angle between the cutting edge and the centerline of the workpiece. The examiner agreed that Cutlan is not a monolithic structure. Applicant asserted that the cutting edge of Cutlan does not cut through the surface of the workpiece, however, it is believed that in figure 2 of Cutlan the cutting edge k is clearly cutting through the surface of the workpiece .